



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/646,802	10/17/2000	Petteri Putkiranta	4925-88PUS	4925-88PUS 1591		
7590 10/20/2005			EXAMINER			
Michael C Stua	art	SMITH, SHEILA B				
Cohen Pontani I	ieberman & Pavane					
Suite 1210			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
551 Fifth Avenue			2681	2681		
New York, NY	10176			_		

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No). <i>F</i>	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/646,802	F	PUTKIRANTA, PETTERI			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Sheila B. Smith		2681			
Period for I	The MAILING DATE of this communicati Reply	ion appears on the cov	er sheet with the cor	respondence ad	ldress		
THE MA - Extension after SIX - If the per - If NO per - Failure to Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day nod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, ho ation. ys, a reply within the statutory no y period will apply and will expirely statute, cause the application	wever, may a reply be timely ninimum of thirty (30) days we re SIX (6) MONTHS from the n to become ABANDONED (y filed vill be considered time e mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. communication.		
Status			•				
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>18 April 2005</u> .					
2a)∐ TI	his action is FINAL . 2b)	☑ This action is non-fi	nal.	•			
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition	of Claims						
4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	laim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application) Of the above claim(s) is/are walaim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction	rithdrawn from conside					
Application	n Papers						
9) <u></u> Th	e specification is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.					
10) □ T h	D)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the ne oath or declaration is objected to by	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			* *		
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	knowledgment is made of a claim for f	uments have been red uments have been red ne priority documents Bureau (PCT Rule 17	ceived. ceived in Application have been received .2(a)).	n No in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s)							
` ') of References Cited (PTO-892)	41 [Interview Summary (P	TO-413)			
2)	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-Stion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO o(s)/Mail Date	948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Pate	··	O-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/646,802

Art Unit: 2681

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burhrmann et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,950,125) in view of Moelard et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,371,738).

Regarding claims 1-4, Burhrmann discloses a communications system (100, 300) comprising base stations (101) for providing mobile stations (115) with communications links and at least one localized service area (105)(which reads on column 2 lines 2-5); comprising a service server which is arranged to maintain information concerning the location of mobile stations in localized service areas (which reads on column 7 lines 4-16) and to generate requests for changing the service selection offered to mobile stations (which reads on column 13 lines 4-8), and means (108, 109) for changing the service selection offered to a mobile station on the initiative of the communications system in response to an indication of the arrival of the mobile station in said localized service area (which reads on column 7 lines 40-54 and disclosed in block 443 of figure 4B). However, Burhrmann fails to specifically disclose a mobile station generated messages describing the location of the mobile stations in relation to localized service areas.

Application/Control Number: 09/646,802

Art Unit: 2681

In the same field of endeavor Moelard et al. discloses a wireless local area network system with mobile station handover. Additionally Moelard et al. discloses a mobile station generated messages describing the location of the mobile stations in relation to localized service areas as disclosed in column 2 lines 51-60.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve Burhrmann by modifying a location-dependent cellular service profile with a mobile station generated messages describing the location of the mobile stations in relation to localized service areas as taught by Moelard et al. for the purpose of utilizing a transparent bridge to updated the system.

Regarding claims 5,6, Buhrmann et al. disclose a cellular mobile station comprising a control block, adapted so as to store the information required for recognizing a localized service area, whereby the mobile station is adapted so as to send a notification of its arrival in the localized service area in response to the recognition of the localized service area, said notification being intended as an impulse for changing the service selection offered to the mobile station (which reads on column 2 lines 60-65). However Buhrmann fails to specifically disclose a cellular mobile station having a memory means.

In the same field of endeavor Moelard et al. discloses a wireless local area network system with mobile station handover. Additionally Moelard et al. discloses a cellular mobile station having memory means as disclosed in column 4 lines 11-20.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve Burhrmann by modifying a location-

Application/Control Number: 09/646,802

Art Unit: 2681

dependent cellular service profile with cellular mobile station having memory means as taught by Moelard et al. for the purpose of storing and utilizing a transparent bridge to updated the system.

Regarding claims 7-12, Buhrmann et al. discloses a method for changing the service selection offered to a mobile station in a communications system that comprises base stations for providing mobile stations with communications links, comprises steps in which from, the mobile station there is received a message indicating that the mobile station has detected that it is in the localized service area information is generated about the arrival of a mobile station in a localized service area (which reads on column 7 lines 4-16), and the service selection offered to said mobile station on the initiative of the communications system is changed (which reads on column 2 lines 60-65 and on column 7 lines 40-54 and disclosed in block 443 of figure 4B).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding applicant argument concerning claim 1, that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a mobile station generating a message describing the location of the mobile station in relation to a localized service area, the examiner contends that "the cellular telephone establishes a communications link with the first MTSO, the cellular telephone also identifies its home MTSO to first MTSO 107 by downloading the

Art Unit: 2681

contents of the MIN field 203 (FIG. 2) to the first MTSO 107 (FIG. 1)" which reads on this limitation.

Regarding applicant argument concerning claim 5, that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a mobile station having a memory capable of storing information required to recognizing a service area, the examiner agrees, and that is why Moelard et at. was used to disclose this limitation.

Regarding applicant argument concerning claim 7, that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a mobile station detecting that it is in a localized area, the examiner contends that "it being understood that service profiles may be stored in any intelligent network node" reads on that limitation.

Art Unit: 2681

Response to Amendment

3. In view of the appeal brief filed on 4/18/05, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2681

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sheila B. Smith whose telephone number is (571)272-

7847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 am - 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Smith \leq , \leq

August 4, 2005

JOSEPH FEILD

Page 7

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER